DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 394 UD 021 752

AUTHOR Sanders, George; Fong, Susan
TITLE 1975-76 LAU Compliance Evaluation Report. Report No. 77-9.
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Schools, Wash. Dept. of Management Information Services.
PUB DATE May 77
NOTE 57p.; Tables may be marginally legible due to small size type.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Bilingual Education; *Compliance (Legal); Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *School Demography; Second Language Instruction; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS Lau V Nichols; Limited English Speaking; *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This report presents data collected during the 1975-76 school year in Seattle, Washington as a part of the school district's activities to comply with the Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court decision by categorizing students according to language background. The first section of the report outlines the population survey and the methods employed to obtain data. The second section provides statistical data regarding the number and distribution of students with limited English backgrounds, a comparison of academic achievement between English fluent and and limited English ability students, and a comparison of achievement gains between these two groups after the introduction of bilingual services. Also found in this section are descriptions of district offered special language services, English as a Second Language (ESL) or Bilingual Instruction in Required Subject Matter (RSM), estimates of the numbers of students served, by language background, and a discussion of the effects of services on student achievement. (APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209394

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David G. Colwell, Jr.
Seattle Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1975-76 LAU COMPLIANCE EVALUATION REPORT

REPORT NO. 77-9
MAY, 1977

GEORGE SANDERS
SUSAN FONG

Department of
Management Information Services

SEATTLE
PUBLIC
SCHOOLS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data processing support from EDSD is gratefully acknowledged. Numerous keypunch operators, computer operators, production control staff, and programmers worked on very short notice to provide the timely reports necessary to meet the District's needs for current information.

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administrative and Service Center
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

1975-76 LAU COMPLIANCE EVALUATION REPORT

REPORT NO. 77-9
MAY, 1977

GEORGE SANDERS
SUSAN FONG

MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION
Robert L. Nelson
Assistant Superintendent

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Susan Stier, Coordinator

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION
David G. Colwell, Jr., Supervisor

Prepared by:

George Sanders
Planner/Evaluator

Susan Fong
Evaluator II

Approved by:

David G. Colwell, Jr.
Supervisor

Susan Stier
Coordinator

Technical Assistance by:

Geraldine Crockett
Evaluator II

Michael Ragghianti
Statistical Clerk II

ABSTRACT

This report, 1975-76 Lau Compliance Evaluation Report, presents the data collected during the 1975-76 school year as a part of the District's activities to comply with the Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court Decision.

In June, 1976, 2,616 students identified as having a primary or home language other than English were enrolled in Seattle Public Schools. Subsequent data have indicated that many students dominant in English were not identified, but that substantially all of the students dominant in a language other than English (1,052) were identified.

Over fifty languages were represented in the District. The major language groups were Cantonese (724), Tagalog (374), Vietnamese (237), Japanese (191), Korean (190), Spanish (171), Samoan (143), and Ilokano (107).

Large proportions of students dominant in non-English languages were found to be underachieving on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), administered in English.

Students from non-English language backgrounds who were fluent in English were found to score above the District average on Spelling and Mathematics Computation subtests of the MAT and below the District average on the Reading subtest.

Great variation was found between the various language groups in their overall level of academic achievement, with Japanese-speaking students scoring higher than other groups, and Spanish and Samoan students scoring lower than other groups.

Approximately 80% of the students dominant in a language other than English were served through formal bilingual and special English programs. Fifty-seven percent received bilingual or special English classes. The remaining students received various combinations of classes and tutorial support which provided both special English and bilingual service. A survey of building staff indicated that of the 20% not receiving service at the end of the year, many were receiving undocumented service or had become dominant in English so that only approximately five percent of the students of limited English ability were not receiving service.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURES	3
DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION	3
PROCEDURES	3
DESCRIPTION OF DATA SOURCES	4
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	4
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	5
RESULTS	7
NUMBERS OF STUDENTS	7
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS WITH EQUAL OR BETTER ENGLISH FLUENCY	14
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF LIMITED ENGLISH ABILITY STUDENTS	18
ACHIEVEMENT GAINS DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR	22
SPECIAL LANGUAGE SERVICES	24
STUDENTS SERVED	28
EFFECTS OF SERVICE ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	33
CONCLUSIONS	35
APPENDIX	37

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE 1:	DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY LANGUAGE GROUP (JUNE, 1976)	8
TABLE 2:	DISTRIBUTION OF ALL STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY GRADE LEVEL (JUNE, 1976).	9
TABLE 3:	DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY SCHOOL (JUNE 1976).	11
TABLE 4:	PERCENTAGES SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS WHO ARE EQUALLY OR MORE FLUENT IN ENGLISH AND FOR THE TOTAL DISTRICT (GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976) . . .	15
TABLE 5:	PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS LANGUAGE GROUPS WHO ARE EQUALLY OR MORE FLUENT IN ENGLISH (GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976).	16
TABLE 6:	PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH BACKGROUNDS WHO ARE EQUALLY OR MORE FLUENT IN ENGLISH AND FOR THE TOTAL DISTRICT BY GRADE LEVEL (APRIL, 1976).	17
TABLE 7:	PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY (GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976)	19
TABLE 8:	PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS LANGUAGE GROUPS WHO HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY (GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976).	20
TABLE 9:	PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY GRADE LEVEL (APRIL, 1976).	21

Page

TABLE 10: PERCENTILE SCORE GAINS OF STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS RELATIVE TO THE GAINS OF ALL STUDENTS IN THE DISTRICT ON VARIOUS SUBTESTS OF THE MAT (GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN THE 1975-76 SCHOOL YEAR). 23

TABLE 11: NATIVE LANGUAGE AND JOB CLASSIFICATION FOR BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAM STAFF (JUNE, 1976). 27

TABLE 12: SUMMARY OF SERVICES RECEIVED BY STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS 1975-1976, BY SERVICE TYPE. 29

TABLE 13: SUMMARY OF SERVICES RECEIVED BY LESAS, 1975-76, BY SERVICE TYPE AND NATIVE LANGUAGE BACKGROUND 30

TABLE 14: SUMMARY OF SERVICES RECEIVED BY EGESAS, 1975-76, BY SERVICE TYPE AND NATIVE LANGUAGE BACKGROUND 31

TABLE 15: PERCENTAGES OF LESAS AND EGESAS FROM VARIOUS LANGUAGE GROUPS WHO RECEIVED ESL OR RSM SERVICES DURING THE 1975-76 SCHOOL YEAR. 32

TABLE 16: RELATIVE GAINS OF SERVED AND UNSERVED STUDENTS COMPARED TO THE ENTIRE DISTRICT (APRIL, 1976) 34

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

During the 1974-75 school year, the U.S. Office for Civil Rights (OCR) required the Seattle Public Schools to identify the number of students from non-English language backgrounds in the District. In addition, the District was required to categorize students by language background, by degree of English fluency compared to native language fluency, and by participation in special English or bilingual programs.

On the basis of the information supplied them, OCR determined in the Summer of 1975 that the Seattle Public Schools did not provide an equal educational opportunity to students from non-English language backgrounds as required by the Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court Decision. Specifically, the District was charged with failure to adequately identify students from non-English language backgrounds, failure to accurately assess English fluency relative to native language fluency, and failure to sufficiently provide special instructional programs for students of limited English speaking ability.

The District responded with its November 7, 1975 Plan to Maintain Compliance with the Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court Decision. This plan outlined procedures for evaluation of the various bilingual and special English programs in the District, and for identification of students to be served by those programs. This is a final report which summarizes the information collected during the 1975-76 school year as a part of that plan.

Overview of the Report

The following section lists the procedures used to obtain the data. The limitations of those procedures are presented in the following section. The data are presented in the subsequent section and the final section contains a discussion of the data.

PROCEDURES

Description of the Population

The population of interest consisted of all students in the District who had a primary language or a home language other than English, i.e., a non-English language background.

Procedures

A list of students who had been referred to the District Bilingual Programs Office as having a primary or home language other than English was entered on a computer file. Lists of the students attending each school building were sent to the principal of that building for verification and for the addition of new students. Simultaneously, the District's student registration procedure was modified so that the first language learned and the home language of all new students were obtained at registration. Additional students from non-English language backgrounds, identified through registration or by building principals, were added to the file.

Each newly identified student was interviewed by Bilingual Programs Office staff to verify language background and determine English fluency relative to native language fluency. Students were categorized into one of the five fluency categories, defined by OCR, as follows:

A. Monolingual speakers of a language other than English.

B. Bilingual students who speak English, but are dominant in a language other than English.

C. Bilingual students who speak English and another language equally well.

D. Bilingual students who are dominant in English.

E. Monolingual English speakers.

The system for categorizing students' English fluency relative to fluency in another language was not equivalent to rating students' English fluency. For example, a category B student who was very fluent in English but even more fluent in another language might have been more fluent in English than many monolingual English speakers. On the other hand, a category B student might have very little English fluency. The categorization system was designed to define a student population requiring special programs under the

Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court Decision. Category A and B students are dominant in a language other than English and require special programs in their native language. Category C, D, and E students do not require such programs. For this report, fluency data are frequently summarized according to these larger categories:

- Students of Limited English Ability (LESA), categories A and B.
- Students with Equal or Greater English Fluency (EGESA), categories C, D, and E.

Fluency classification data were added to the file along with data from the student master file, the test history file, and data from class rosters for various bilingual and special English programs. The file was updated periodically to include new students and delete students transferring out of the District.

Description of Data Sources

The following data sources were used to obtain the data presented in this report.

1. Building Principal Survey, conducted to verify computer lists and add new students to the file in February, 1976.
2. Home Language Identification Form (see Appendix, page 38), completed by all newly registering students to identify new students with non-English language backgrounds.
3. Student Language Assessment Forms (see Appendix, page 39), completed by Bilingual Programs staff to record the native language and fluency classification of each identified student.
4. ESL/Bilingual Class Rosters and ESL/Bilingual Tutoring Information Forms (see Appendix, pages 40 and 41), completed by bilingual and special English program instructors and tutors to record students receiving special programs.
5. Student Master File, to gather information routinely maintained for all District students, including name, school, and grade level.
6. Test History File, to gather Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) scores from the District's group testing program, consisting of the administration of the appropriate form of the MAT to grades two, four, six, and eight in October and April.

Statistical Analysis

The numbers and percentages of students from non-English language backgrounds

were tabulated by language group, fluency classification, grade level, and attending school.

Percentages of underachieving students from non-English language backgrounds, i.e., those scoring in the lower three stanines on MAT Reading and Mathematics subtests, were tabulated and compared to percentages of underachieving students in the District as a whole. Furthermore, the numbers and percentages of underachievers in the major language groups were tabulated and compared for the two major fluency categories of relative English fluency, LESAs and EGESAs.

The school year achievement gains of students from non-English language backgrounds were analyzed through a comparison of their yearly gains on each MAT subtest with the average gains exhibited by all students tested on that subtest. The procedure followed was similar to that described in Report No. 76-22, Expected Gains on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, and consisted of calculating the difference between each student's actual post-test score and the average post-test score of all students tested with the same pre-test score. The average difference was calculated for all students from non-English language backgrounds and for LESAs and EGESAs from the major language groups.

Student participation in various bilingual and special English programs was determined by tabulating the number of students from various language groups and fluency categories who participated in each type of program.

The achievement gains of students who participated in the various bilingual and special English programs were analyzed through a comparison of the differences between groups of students' actual post-test scores, after subtracting the average post-test scores of students from all programs with similar pre-test scores, similar to the procedure described above.

Limitations of the Study

1. Interviews were conducted throughout the year to categorize students' English fluency relative to native language fluency. At the time the data were analyzed, some fluency ratings were current and others were as much as a year old. It is likely that some students had progressed in English fluency during the year, so that an indeterminant number of students assigned to categories A, B, and C were actually category B, C, or D students at the time the data was analyzed.

2. Initial identification of students from non-English language backgrounds was, in most cases, made by school staff. Although it was relatively easy for school staff to identify LESAs, it was more difficult to identify EGESAs. Data gathered during the 1976-77 school year indicated that approximately 2,500 EGESAs were not identified.

3. Academic achievement test scores were obtained for many LESAs. These scores should be interpreted with care, since the MAT was

administered in English. For these students, a low score more likely indicated limited English fluency than a real deficit in academic achievement. However, test scores for students in categories C, D, and E, can be considered as valid as for native English speakers in measuring student achievement.

RESULTS

Numbers of Students

During the 1974-75 school year, 2,901 students from non-English language backgrounds were identified. Of these, approximately ten percent transferred out of the District during the year. (A similar rate of transfers occurred for the District as a whole.) In June, there were a total of 2,616 students identified from non-English language backgrounds attending Seattle Public Schools.

The numbers of students in each fluency category were as follows:

A.	No English	267	(10.2%)
B.	Less English than another language	754	(28.8%)
C.	Equal English and another language	778	(29.7%)
D.	More English than another language	639	(24.4%)
E.	Only English	151	(5.8%)
	TOTAL	2,589	

An additional twenty-seven students were identified but could not be reached for fluency assessment prior to the end of the school year.

Table 1 shows the number and percentage of all students from various language backgrounds and of LESAs of various language backgrounds. Several language groups were composite groups, e.g., Chinese and Filipino. These groups were included in the building survey because building staff could not always distinguish between the various languages spoken by a national or ethnic group. The English language group consisted of monolingual English students who had a non-English language background but whose present home language was English.

Of the major language groups, the Vietnamese showed the highest percentage of LESAs, 92%, followed by Korean with 67%. Other major language groups, Chinese, Filipino, Spanish, Japanese, and Samoan, varied from 37% to 26% LESAs. The seven largest language groups represented 74% of the total students from non-English language backgrounds and 88% of the LESAs. The remaining students represented over twenty-six different language groups with no more than forty students in a group.

Table 2 gives the grade distribution of students from non-English language backgrounds and LESAs from all language groups. The number of students and percentage of students in the District are shown for each grade level.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY LANGUAGE GROUP (JUNE, 1976)

Language Group	Total Students from Non-English Language Backgrounds		Limited English Speaking Ability Students	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
CHINESE LANGUAGES[1]	277	10.6	82	7.8
Cantonese	447	17.1	175	16.6
Mandarin	47	1.8	31	2.9
PHILIPPINE LANGUAGES[1]	121	4.6	29	2.8
Tagalog	253	9.7	64	6.1
Ilocano	107	4.1	32	3.0
Visayan	3	0.1	1	0.1
KOREAN	190	7.3	128	12.2
SPANISH	171	6.5	54	5.1
JAPANESE	191	7.3	60	5.7
SAMOAN	143	5.5	53	5.0
AMERICAN INDIAN	2	0.1	0	0.0
ARABIC	19	0.7	8	0.8
LANGUAGES OF INDIA[1]	14	0.5	6	0.6
Bengali	1	0.0	0	0.0
Hindi	20	0.8	12	1.1
DANISH	4	0.2	2	0.2
DUTCH	8	0.3	5	0.5
ESKIMO	4	0.2	0	0.0
FRENCH	13	0.5	7	0.7
FINNISH	5	0.2	2	0.2
GERMAN	35	1.3	1	0.1
GREEK	39	1.5	4	0.4
HAWAIIAN	1	0.0	0	0.0
HUNGARIAN	2	0.1	2	0.2
ITALIAN	13	0.5	2	0.2
NORWEGIAN	31	1.2	8	0.8
PAKISTANI	1	0.0	0	0.0
PERSIAN	1	0.0	1	0.1
POLISH	5	0.2	2	0.2
PORTUGUESE	5	0.2	5	0.5
RUSSIAN	5	0.2	1	0.1
SWEDISH	14	0.5	2	0.2
THAI	12	0.5	7	0.7
TURKISH	6	0.2	0	0.0
UKRAINIAN	4	0.2	0	0.0
VIETNAMESE	237	9.1	219	20.8
YIDDISH	2	0.1	2	0.2
YUGOSLAVIAN	2	0.1	1	0.1
ROMANY	18	0.7	5	0.5
ENGLISH[2]	73	2.8	0	0.0
Other Known Languages	63	2.4	35	3.3
Unknown Languages	7	0.3	4	0.4
TOTAL	2,616	100.0	1,052	100.0

[1] Includes students from any of a group of major national dialects or languages not specifically identified.

[2] Includes students who are presently monolingual English speakers but whose first learned language or home language was other than English.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY GRADE LEVEL
(JUNE, 1976)

Grade	District	Total Students from Non-English Language Backgrounds		Limited English Speaking Ability Students	
	Total	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
K	5,006	232	4.6	110	2.2
1	4,854	260	5.4	114	2.3
2	4,631	250	5.4	93	2.0
3	4,450	221	5.0	80	1.8
4	4,305	216	5.0	78	1.8
5	4,472	223	5.0	76	1.7
6	4,687	224	4.8	69	1.5
7	4,888	208	4.3	76	1.6
8	4,972	183	3.7	82	1.6
9	5,235	150	2.9	63	1.2
10	5,240	174	3.3	94	1.8
11	5,149	157	3.0	63	1.2
12	4,995	118	2.4	54	1.1
TOTAL	62,884	2,616	4.2	1,052	1.7

Both the number of non-English language students and the number of LESAs declined slightly in the higher grades. The proportion of LESAs remained close to forty percent in all grade levels.

The distribution of students by school for high schools, junior high and middle schools, and elementary schools is given in Table 3. As in Table 2, the total number of students, the number and percentage of students from non-English language backgrounds, and the number and percentage of LESAs are given.

The percentages of students from non-English language backgrounds ranged from zero at three schools to thirty-six percent at Beacon Hill and thirty-three percent at Gatzert. The percentage of LESAs ranged from twenty percent at the Gypsy School, seventeen percent at Gatzert, and fifteen percent at Beacon Hill to zero in eight schools. Because of their larger attendance areas, the secondary schools generally had greater concentrations of LESAs and other students from non-English language backgrounds than did elementary schools. However, Beacon Hill and Gatzert Elementary Schools had nearly as many students from non-English language backgrounds as Franklin High School and Mercer Junior High, the most impacted secondary schools.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY SCHOOL
(JUNE, 1976)
HIGH SCHOOL

School	Total Students	Total Students from Non-English Language Backgrounds		Limited English Speaking Ability Students	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ballard	1,490	32	2.1	5	0.3
Cleveland	854	91	10.7	32	3.7
Franklin	1,224	154	12.6	63	5.1
Garfield	1,340	7	0.5	4	0.3
Hale	1,627	7	0.4	6	0.4
Ingraham	1,758	15	0.9	12	0.7
Lincoln	1,465	52	3.5	28	1.9
Queen Anne	1,279	22	1.7	11	0.9
Rainier Beach	1,036	20	1.9	13	1.3
Roosevelt	1,942	24	1.2	23	1.2
Sealth	1,358	44	3.2	29	2.1
West Seattle	1,403	4	0.3	4	0.3
TOTAL	16,776	472	2.8	230	1.4

JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOL

School	Total Students	Total Student from Non-English Language Backgrounds		Limited English Speaking Ability Students	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Addams	1,366	18	1.3	16	1.1
Blaine	588	15	2.6	5	0.8
Boren	695	31	4.5	18	2.6
Denny	1,205	6	0.5	5	0.4
Eckstein	1,201	21	1.7	10	0.8
Hamilton	680	16	2.4	14	2.1
Madison	1,302	33	2.5	4	0.3
McClure	612	11	1.8	5	0.8
Meany	843	13	1.5	8	0.9
Mercer	1,245	174	14.0	84	6.7
Monroe	913	4	0.4	4	0.4
Sharples	844	82	9.7	11	1.3
South Shore	999	87	8.7	19	1.9
Thompson	842	3	0.3	2	0.2
Whitman	710	35	4.9	6	0.8
Wilson	692	27	3.9	12	1.7
TOTAL	14,737	576	3.9	223	1.5

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY SCHOOL
(JUNE, 1976)
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

School	Total Students	Total Students from Non-English Language Backgrounds		Limited English Speaking Ability Students	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Adams	388	8	2.1	2	0.5
Alki	214	12	5.6	5	2.3
Allen	358	5	1.4	5	1.4
Arbor Heights	548	5	0.9	1	0.2
Bagley	357	14	3.9	8	2.2
Beacon Hill	389	141	36.2	58	14.9
Briarcliff	338	17	5.0	1	0.2
Brighton	348	84	24.1	14	4.0
Broadview	559	8	1.4	5	0.9
Bryant	382	9	2.4	7	1.8
Cedar Park	228	9	3.9	2	0.9
Coe	369	7	1.9	1	0.3
Colman	337	11	3.3	6	1.8
Columbia	312	41	13.1	16	5.1
Concord	241	1	0.4	0	0.0
Cooper	352	27	7.6	20	5.7
Crown Hill	289	1	0.3	0	0.0
Day	407	14	3.4	13	3.2
Dearborn Park	494	81	16.4	9	1.8
Decatur	311	4	1.3	4	1.3
Dunlap	388	22	5.7	3	0.8
Emerson	395	9	2.3	7	1.8
Fairmount Park	372	18	4.8	8	2.2
Fairview	254	8	3.1	2	0.8
Fauntleroy	334	5	1.5	4	1.2
Gatewood	430	2	0.5	1	0.2
Gatzert	401	135	33.7	69	17.2
Genesee Hill	299	7	2.3	2	0.7
Graham Hill	277	14	5.1	2	0.7
Green Lake	251	7	2.8	3	1.2
Greenwood	376	9	2.4	5	1.3
Gypsy School	15	15	100.0	3	20.0
Haller Lake	359	1	0.3	1	0.3
Hawthorne	271	7	2.6	6	2.2
Hay	371	13	3.5	6	1.6
High Point	264	24	9.1	9	3.4
Highland Park	675	15	2.2	8	1.2
Hughes	452	1	0.8	0	0.0
Jefferson	380	11	2.9	7	1.8
Kimball	439	80	18.2	37	8.4
King	363	2	0.6	1	0.3
Lafayette	638	12	1.9	7	1.1
Lake City	322	73	22.7	14	5.3

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS AND STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY SCHOOL

School	Total Students	Total Students from Non-English Language Backgrounds		Limited English Speaking Ability Students	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Latona	201	19	9.5	1	0.5
Laurelhurst	373	13	3.5	8	2.1
Lawton	344	23	6.7	1	0.3
Leschi	439	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lowell	254	28	11.0	15	5.9
Loyal Heights	273	8	2.9	3	1.1
Madrona	848	4	0.5	2	0.2
Magnolia	451	34	7.5	7	1.6
Maple	431	27	6.3	7	1.6
Maple Leaf	304	34	11.1	13	4.3
McDonald	345	21	6.1	14	4.1
McGilvra	213	0	0.0	0	0.0
Minor	515	8	1.6	5	9.7
Mountlake	268	4	1.5	2	7.5
Muir/Muir Annex	553	2	0.4	2	0.4
North Beach	301	9	3.0	0	0.0
North Queen Anne	280	7	2.5	2	0.7
Northgate	282	0	0.0	0	0.0
Oak Lake	373	9	2.4	6	1.6
Olympic Hills	388	4	1.0	1	0.2
Olympic View	245	8	3.3	1	0.4
Pinehurst	293	7	2.4	4	1.4
Rainier View	174	2	1.1	2	1.1
Ravenna	365	7	1.9	4	1.1
Rogers	400	11	2.8	2	0.5
Roxhill	357	21	5.9	8	2.2
Sacajawea	224	10	4.5	10	4.5
Sand Point	235	14	6.0	1	0.4
Sanislo	355	10	2.8	7	2.0
Schmitz Park	249	7	2.8	7	2.8
Seward	242	5	2.1	2	0.8
Stevens	340	3	0.9	0	0.0
University Heights	393	16	4.1	14	3.6
Van Asselt	602	65	10.8	20	3.3
View Ridge	299	17	5.7	8	2.7
Viewlands	387	7	1.8	4	1.0
Webster	356	4	1.1	4	1.1
Wedgewood	338	7	2.1	1	0.3
West Queen Anne	248	6	2.4	2	0.8
West Woodland	637	7	1.1	7	1.1
Whittier	523	7	1.3	2	0.4
Whitworth	531	60	11.3	4	0.7
Wing Luke	325	19	5.8	12	3.7
TOTAL	31,139	1,563	5.0	597	1.9
GRAND TOTAL	62,652*	2,611*	4.2	1,050*	1.7

*Does not include students in special programs

Academic Achievement of Students with Equal or Better English Fluency

MAT scores for each subtest of the MAT administered in the Spring of 1976 were analyzed for EGESAs. Table 4 shows a comparison of the number of underachieving students (scoring in the lower three stanines) between EGESAs and the total District. These results are based upon test scores of approximately ninety-five percent of the students in each group.

EGESAs scored significantly lower on the Word Knowledge, Total Reading, and Science subtests and significantly higher on the Spelling and Mathematics Computation subtests than the District as a whole. On all other subtests, there were no statistically significant differences.

Table 5 shows comparable data for the seven major language groups and for a combination of all other language groups. Students in the Japanese and Chinese language groups scored significantly above the District as a whole on many subtests of the MAT, and the Samoan and Spanish language groups scored significantly lower on most subtests. While relatively large proportions of students in the Vietnamese language group scored in the lower three stanines, the differences were seldom significant because of the small number of EGESAs in that group.

Table 6 presents a breakdown of the data presented in Table 4 by grade level. There were few significant differences between EGESAs and the District as a whole at most grade levels and subtests. However, EGESAs scored significantly higher on the sixth grade Language, Spelling, and Mathematics Computation subtests, and significantly lower on the eighth grade Word Knowledge, Total Reading, and Science subtests. The differences found in the sixth and eighth grade were the major contributors to the significant differences found in Table 4. In grades two and four, there were no signficant differences between the District and EGESAs.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGES SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS WHO ARE EQUALLY OR MORE FLUENT IN ENGLISH AND FOR THE TOTAL DISTRICT (GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976)

MAT Subtest	Students from Non-English Language Backgrounds		Total District	
	Number Tested	Percent in lower three stanines	Number Tested	Percent in lower three stanines
Word Analysis[1]	146	4.8%	4,089	7.7%
Word Knowledge	508	23.6%*	16,549	17.9%
Reading	507	21.9%	16,589	19.6%
TOTAL READING	507	24.1%*	16,481	20.2%
LANGUAGE[2]	348	24.0%	12,571	26.2%
SPELLING	500	13.6%**	16,218	19.6%
Math Computation[2]	510	16.7%**	16,616	23.5%
Math Concepts[2]	505	20.6%	16,538	20.4%
Math Problem Solving[2]	506	20.6%	16,496	21.6%
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	496	19.0%	16,368	21.3%
SCIENCE[3]	105	33.3%*	3,663	23.2%
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	109	22.0%	3,964	22.3%

[1] Only administered to second grade students

[2] Not administered to second grade students

[3] Optional in grades six and eight

* Significantly more students in the lower three stanines than the District average

** Significantly fewer students in the lower three stanines than the District average

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST
OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS LANGUAGE GROUPS
WHO ARE EQUALLY OR MORE FLUENT IN ENGLISH
(GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976)

MAT Subtest	Chinese Languages		Philippine Languages		Korean		Spanish		Japanese		Samoan		Vietnamese		Other Languages	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Word Analysis[1]	44	2.3%	25	4.0%	5	0.0%	10	0.0%	14	0.0%	11	18.2%	0	---	37	8.1%
Word Knowledge	163	16.0%	109	20.2%	24	33.3%	45	42.2%*	42	2.4%**	30	53.3%*	5	80.0%*	90	26.7%*
Reading	164	15.2%	109	22.9%	24	20.8%	44	45.5%*	42	0.0%**	30	43.3%*	4	50.0%*	90	23.3%
TOTAL READING	163	16.0%	109	25.7%	24	25.0%	44	43.2%*	42	0.0%**	30	46.7%*	5	60.0%	90	28.9%
LANGUAGE[2]	118	14.4%**	83	22.9%	18	16.7%	34	47.1%*	28	0.0%**	19	73.7%*	4	25.0%	54	30.0%
SPELLING	159	10.7%**	106	7.6%	25	8.0%	44	31.8%*	42	0.0%**	28	21.4%	5	20.0%	91	22.0%
Math Computation[2]	164	9.2%**	107	14.0%**	25	4.0%**	44	47.8%*	42	0.0%**	31	41.9%*	5	20.0%	92	20.7%
Math Concepts[2]	162	8.6%**	107	17.8%	24	12.5%	45	42.2%*	40	5.0%**	29	62.1%*	5	40.0%	93	29.0%
Math Problem Solv.[2]	161	9.9%**	107	18.7%	25	8.0%	43	39.5%*	42	11.9%	30	60.0%*	5	40.0%	93	25.8%
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	160	8.1%**	104	16.4%	24	4.2%**	42	42.9%*	40	5.0%**	29	58.6%*	5	40.0%	92	26.1%
SCIENCE[3]	32	25.0%	29	44.8%*	7	28.6%	9	44.4%	9	0.0%	9	77.8%*	1	100.0%	9	0.0%
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	33	18.1%	31	22.6%	7	0.0%	10	50.0%*	9	0.0%	9	66.7%*	1	0.0%	9	0.0%

[1]Only administered to second grade students

[2]Not administered to second grade students

[3]Optional in grades six and eight

*Significantly more students in the lower three stanines than the District average

**Significantly fewer students in the lower three stanines than the District average

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH BACKGROUNDS WHO ARE EQUALLY OR MORE FLUENT IN ENGLISH AND FOR THE TOTAL DISTRICT BY GRADE LEVEL (APRIL, 1976)

MAT Subtest	Students from Non-English Language Background								Total District							
	Grade 2		Grade 4		Grade 6		Grade 8		Grade 2		Grade 4		Grade 6		Grade 8	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Word Analysis[1]	146	4.8%	---	---	---	---	---	---	4,089	7.7%	---	---	---	---	---	---
Word Knowledge	147	15.7%	128	20.3%	141	26.2%	92	37.0%*	4,095	14.9%	3,936	17.8%	4,250	19.7%	4,268	19.2%
Reading	146	11.6%	128	25.0%	142	26.1%	91	27.5%	4,071	15.7%	3,936	19.1%	4,251	22.4%	4,271	21.1%
TOTAL READING	147	12.9%	128	27.3%	141	29.1%	91	29.7%*	4,074	16.2%	3,927	21.9%	4,244	22.7%	4,236	20.1%
LANGUAGE[2]	---	---	128	26.6%	140	15.0%**	90	34.4%	-----	---	3,944	25.1%	4,307	25.9%	4,320	27.5%
SPELLING	147	10.4%	124	14.5%	140	10.7%**	89	21.4%	3,869	13.2%	3,831	21.5%	4,264	17.9%	4,254	25.4%
Math Computation[2]	147	14.3%	127	25.2%	140	14.3%**	96	12.5%	3,968	18.5%	3,960	32.7%	4,291	24.3%	4,397	18.9%
Math Concepts[2]	146	22.6%	128	23.4%	137	16.8%	94	19.2%	3,953	18.5%	3,933	20.7%	4,273	21.8%	4,379	20.4%
Math Problem Solving[2]	147	17.0%	128	22.7%	139	17.3%	92	28.3%	3,952	18.4%	3,922	22.9%	4,265	22.2%	4,357	23.0%
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	146	17.1%	127	25.2%	136	15.4%	87	18.4%	4,046	16.3%	3,893	27.4%	4,232	21.9%	4,197	19.8%
SCIENCE[3]	---	---	---	---	77	26.0%	28	53.6%*	---	---	---	---	2,691	20.0%	972	31.9%
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	---	---	---	---	77	16.9%	32	34.4%	---	---	---	---	2,680	20.2%	1,224	26.7%

[1]Only administered to second grade students

[2]Not administered to second grade students

[3]Optional in grades six and eight

*Significantly more students in the lower three stanines than the District average

**Significantly fewer students in the lower three stanines than the District average

Academic Achievement of Limited English Ability Students

Table 7 presents the numbers and percentages of LESAs scoring in the lower three stanines on each subtest of the MAT administered in the Spring of 1976. Table 8 shows a breakdown, by language group, of the data contained in Table 7.

As could be expected, large proportions of LESAs scored in the lower three stanines, reflecting their lack of achievement in English, the language in which they were tested. Students speaking Vietnamese, Spanish, and Samoan had greater proportions of underachievers than other language groups. In general, LESAs scored lowest on the Word Knowledge, Reading, Total Reading, and Language subtests, and showed great variability in their scores on the Mathematics subtests.

Table 9 shows a breakdown of underachieving students by grade level. LESAs in grade two showed the highest achievement on the Reading subtests. Students in the higher grades, six and eight, showed the highest achievement on Mathematics subtests. There was a mixed pattern of achievement on other subtests.

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY (GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976)

MAT Subtest	Number Tested	Percent in lower three stanines
Word Analysis[1]	67	22.4%
Word Knowledge	227	67.0%
Reading	227	56.0%
TOTAL READING	226	67.3%
LANGUAGE[2]	153	54.9%
SPELLING	216	37.0%
Math Computation[2]	251	17.1%
Math Concepts[2]	240	40.8%
Math Problem Solving[2]	234	34.2%
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	233	29.6%
SCIENCE[3]	43	74.4%
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	43	70.5%

[1]Only administered to second grade students

[2]Not administered to second grade students

[3]Optional in grades six and eight

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST
OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS LANGUAGE GROUPS
WHO HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY
(GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN APRIL, 1976)

MAT Subtest	Chinese Languages		Philippine Languages		Korean		Spanish		Japanese		Samoan		Vietnamese		Other Languages	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Word Analysis[1]	19	10.5%	7	0.0%	14	28.6%	4	60.0%	6	16.7%	0	---	11	27.3%	6	50.0%
Word Knowledge	63	66.7%	32	62.5.%	38	60.5%	12	75.0%	12	41.7%	9	88.9%	41	75.6%	20	70.0%
Reading	63	49.2%	32	46.9%	38	50.0%	12	66.7%	12	33.3%	9	77.8%	41	80.5%	20	50.0%
TOTAL READING	62	64.5%	32	62.5%	38	60.5%	12	75.0%	12	47.7%	9	88.9%	41	93.0%	20	65.0%
LANGUAGE[2]	46	50.0%	22	45.5%	23	52.2%	8	62.5%	6	50.0%	9	66.7%	25	72.0%	14	50.0%
SPELLING	60	35.0%	29	20.7%	35	28.6%	11	54.6%	11	27.3%	9	44.4%	43	53.5%	18	38.9%
Math Computation[2]	66	3.0%	32	34.4%	41	12.2%	14	64.3%	16	0.0%	10	60.0%	51	5.9%	21	33.3%
Math Concepts[2]	64	21.9%	31	45.2%	40	27.5%	13	84.6%	13	0.0%	9	88.9%	49	61.2%	21	47.6%
Math Problem Solv.[2]	63	17.5%	31	48.4%	39	30.8%	12	66.7%	13	0.0%	9	77.8%	46	37.0%	21	47.6%
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	63	12.7%	31	41.9%	39	20.5%	12	83.3%	13	0.0%	9	66.7%	45	33.3%	21	42.9%
SCIENCE[3]	10	25.0%	3	100.0%	11	90.9%	3	66.7%	3	0.0%	3	100.0%	7	85.7%	3	100.0%
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	10	25.0%	3	100.0%	12	58.3%	3	66.7%	3	33.3%	2	100.0%	8	87.5%	3	100.0%

[1]Only administered to second grade students

[2]Not administered to second grade students

[3]Optional in grades six and eight

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING IN THE LOWER THREE STANINES ON EACH SUBTEST OF THE MAT FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY BY GRADE LEVEL (APRIL, 1976)

MAT Subtest	Grade 2		Grade 4		Grade 6		Grade 8	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Word Analysis[1]	67	22.4%	--	---	--	---	--	---
Word Knowledge	67	41.8%	62	74.2%	51	74.5%	47	85.1%
Reading	66	33.3%	62	62.9%	52	63.5%	47	70.2%
TOTAL READING	66	44.0%	62	79.0%	51	70.6%	47	80.9%
LANGUAGE[2]	--	--	57	59.7%	51	47.1%	45	57.8%
SPELLING	60	21.7%	57	54.4%	51	19.6%	48	54.2%
Math Computation[2]	68	20.6%	67	25.4%	56	7.1%	60	13.3%
Math Concepts[2]	67	35.8%	63	57.1%	51	25.5%	59	42.4%
Math Problem Solving[2]	68	32.4%	62	48.3%	49	28.6%	57	26.3%
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	67	26.9%	60	51.7%	49	18.4%	57	19.5%
SCIENCE[3]	--	---	--	---	32	68.8%	11	91.0%
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	--	---	--	---	32	68.8%	12	75.0%

[1]Only administered to second grade students

[2]Not administered to second grade students

[3]Optional in grades six and eight

Achievement Gains During the School Year

The MAT percentile score gains of students from non-English language backgrounds were compared to the test score gains of all students in the District. Table 10 shows the gains of students from each of the major language groups relative to the gains of the District as a whole. A gain of +3 indicates that those students ended the year three percentile points above students who started the year with equivalent scores on the MAT. A gain of zero indicates that those students showed exactly the same gain during the year as other students in the District who started the year with equivalent MAT scores.

A comparison was made between the gains of LESAs and the gains of EGESAs. While LESAs scored lower than EGESAs on the MAT, they showed similar gains during the school year. For this reason, the data in Table 10 include both LESAs and EGESAs.

Overall, students from non-English language backgrounds showed significantly greater gains on the MAT Spelling subtest than did students in the District as a whole, ending the year 4.8 percentile points above the District as a whole. On the other hand, students from non-English language backgrounds showed significantly lower gains on the Word Knowledge subtest, -2.8, than did the District as a whole.

On all other subtests, students from non-English language backgrounds exhibited gains very similar to the District as a whole.

Individual language groups showed quite different gains. Students from Chinese language backgrounds showed significantly higher gains on the Spelling subtests than the District. On other subtests, they showed similar gains to the District as a whole. Filipino students also showed significantly higher gains on the Spelling subtest, but showed signficantly lower gains on the Reading, Word Knowledge, and Mathematics Problem Solving subtests. Korean students showed, in general, large gains with the gains reaching significance only on the Mathematics Problem Solving subtests. Spanish students overall showed gains below the District average which were significant for the Reading, Mathematics Computation and Concepts, and Total Mathematics subtests. Japanese students showed both large and small gains, none of which reached statistical significance. Vietnamese students showed gains significantly above the District on the Mathematics Problem Solving and Total Mathematics subtests.

Students from the various language groups showed much different patterns of academic achievement and academic growth. Based upon the data in Tables 5 and 10, it appears that students in the Samoan and Spanish language groups are most in need of special programs to reverse the trend of low achievement in these two groups. Students from the Filipino language groups showed a mixed pattern of achievement with low gains on subtests requiring reading comprehension and word knowledge. The remaining language groups showed achievement levels and achievement growth similar to the rest of the District.

TABLE 10

PERCENTILE SCORE GAINS OF STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS
RELATIVE TO THE GAINS OF ALL STUDENTS IN THE DISTRICT ON VARIOUS SUBTESTS OF THE MAT
(GRADES 2, 4, 6 AND 8 IN THE 1975-76 SCHOOL YEAR)

MAT Subtest	Chinese Languages		Philippine Languages		Korean		Spanish		Japanese		Samoan		Vietnamese		Other Languages	
	N	Gain	N	Gain	N	Gain	N	Gain	N	Gain	N	Gain	N	Gain	N	Gain
Word Analysis[1]	58	-.5	31	+2.1	14	+7.8	10	+1.1	16	+2.3	9	+4.6	4	+13.4	37	+1.3
Word Knowledge	192	-.4	128	-1.7	43	+.4	43	-1.9	46	-2.1	35	-8.9*	19	-2.5	91	-1.3
Reading	195	+.9	127	-2.7	44	+1.7	42	-5.5*	47	+.1	34	-6.9*	19	-1.5	86	+.6
TOTAL READING	192	+.4	125	-1.7	43	+2.7	41	-2.5	47	-1.5	34	-6.2*	18	+1.2	87	.0
LANGUAGE[2]	134	+2.0	94	+.6	28	+.7	30	-3.4	29	+4.5	26	-2.4	15	+4.6	53	+.1
SPELLING[2]	126	+4.3**	88	+8.4**	25	+7.4**	32	+.8	28	+.5	24	-1.0	15	+6.5	52	+2.2
Math Computation[2]	147	+2.9	100	-.7	36	+3.7	32	-12.2*	29	+3.7	27	.0	20	+.3	53	+5.2**
Math Concepts[2]	146	+2.2	101	+2.0	[illegible]	+4.2	31	-9.0*	29	+5.2	25	-6.4	20	+1.5	53	-.6
Math Problem Solv[2]	143	+.1	100	-3.0	35	+7.5**	31	-3.4	30	-.8	25	-3.7	22	+10.1**	56	-.2
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	196	+2.3**	124	-.8	48	+4.1	37	-7.2*	45	+2.7	33	-5.3*	23	+7.9**	84	-1.2
SCIENCE[3]	32	+3.6	27	-3.9	8	-4.1	8	-10.9	11	+9.1	8	-7.7	4	+1.3	9	-2.3
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	35	-.6	30	-.2	11	+6.5	9	-1.2	11	-2.1	9	+.2	4	-6.5	9	-7.5

[1]Only administered to grade two, Fall and Spring

[2]Not administered to grade two in the Fall

[3]Optional in grades six and eight

*Students from non-English language backgrounds showed significantly lower gains than the District as a whole.

**Students from non-English language backgrounds showed significantly greater gains than the District as a whole.

Special Language Services

During the 1975-76 school year, the District provided two major categories of service to students from non-English language backgrounds:

1. English as a Second Language (ESL): instruction in English which covered English language skills, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. ESL was offered to students of limited English speaking ability. Teachers were primarily English speakers, trained in ESL teaching techniques.

2. Bilingual Instruction in Required Subject Matter (RSM): instruction in a non-English language and in English which covered social studies, mathematics, and other subject matter areas required by the District. In addition to serving students of limited English speaking ability, bilingual instruction was offered to English dominant students who wished to maintain a non-English language and to monolingual English speakers desiring to learn another language.

The particular form of ESL or RSM service offered to students at a particular school was determined by the following factors:

- The concentration of students from a single language group.
- The concentration of students of limited English speaking ability.
- The availability of ESL trained or bilingual staff members.
- The availability of various categorically funded programs to the school.

At a given school, students received ESL and/or RSM instruction through formal classes or through individual and small group tutoring. Where the concentration of LESAs was small and there were no trained ESL or bilingual teachers available, community and student volunteers were solicited to provide tutoring.

In addition to District funded programs, services to limited English speaking students were funded through the Washington State URRD Program and the Federal Indo-China Relief Act. During the 1975-76 school year, there were five URRD Bilingual Programs operating in the District.

- Proyecto Saber consisted of a staff of five bilingual Spanish speaking teachers and five Spanish speaking tutors to provide tutoring and counseling services to Spanish surname students.
- Cleveland-Mercer Bilingual School consisted of thirteen staff members and two secretaries to provide RSM, ESL, RSM tutoring, culture studies and special subject matter classes taught in English for Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Samoan students at Cleveland High School and Mercer Junior High.

- Gypsy School consisted of an English speaking teacher, an instructional aide, and a Romany speaking service aide to provide special basic skills instruction to Gypsy students Districtwide.

- Franklin Bilingual Program consisted of two teachers, a program consultant, and a half-time instructional assistant to provide ESL, RSM and special subject matter instruction in English for Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Samoan students at Franklin High School.

- Beacon Hill Chinese-English Bilingual School consisted of two teachers and three instructional assistants to provide RSM and ESL to Chinese students who speak Chinese, and culture studies and Chinese language instruction to English speaking students.

The Indo-China Relief Act funded eight bilingual instructional assistants and a program assistant to provide for the special needs of the recent influx of Vietnamese immigrants.

These services were provided through a variety of certificated, paraprofessional, and volunteer staff with various language backgrounds. To determine staff backgrounds and qualifications, Staff Background and Training forms were compiled for all staff providing services to limited English speaking students. Table 11 shows a breakdown of the native language and job classification of the various staff members. There were seventy-four certificated teachers delivering RSM or ESL services, fifty-seven paraprofessionals, and eight volunteers. Of these, 60% were bilingual in one of the major languages found in the District.

Staff for ESL services included nine specially trained, certificated teachers assigned through the Bilingual Programs Office, usually on an itinerant basis to two or more schools. The Bilingual Programs Office also offered two inservice courses in ESL teaching methods, which included a nine week supervised internship. Principals of schools with small numbers of LESAs were encouraged to arrange release time for interested staff to complete internships, and to follow through with regularly scheduled ESL arrangements in their buildings. During the school year, forty-three teachers and librarians and three paraprofessionals from forty-seven schools completed internships. Of these, forty-two went on to teach ESL classes or tutoring sessions in their buildings. The majority of those teachers were native English speakers.

In spite of vigorous recruiting, adequate numbers of certificated bilingual staff were not available for all language groups. The large influx of Vietnamese refugees presented a particularly acute staffing need. Thus, a number of bilingual paraprofessional teaching assistants, aides, and tutors were hired to work under the supervision of certificated staff. Some paraprofessionals were simultaneously completing coursework needed for degrees and teaching certificates.

The bilingual staff consisted of five full time, certificated teachers assigned on an itinerant basis through the Bilingual Programs Office.

Thirteen additional certificated teachers, eight and one-half paraprofessionals, and thirteen tutors and aides were funded by state URRD grants.

Altogether the 139 ESL and bilingual staff members provided services to 73 schools.

TABLE 11

NATIVE LANGUAGE AND JOB CLASSIFICATION FOR
BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAM STAFF
(JUNE, 1976)

Native Language	ESL			BSM			ESL and BSM			Total
	Certificated	Paraprofessional	Volunteer	Certificated	Paraprofessional	Volunteer	Certificated	Paraprofessional	Volunteer	
English	43	7	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	56
Chinese Languages	4	--	--	5	7	--	3	2	--	21
Philippine Languages	2	--	--	1	7	--	4	--	--	14
Korean	--	--	--	1	5	--	--	--	--	6
Spanish	1	--	--	7	3	--	--	--	--	11
Japanese	--	--	2	--	4	--	--	--	--	6
Samoan	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
Vietnamese	--	--	--	--	18	--	--	--	--	18
Other	1	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	3
Unknown	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
TOTAL	53	9	8	14	46	--	7	2	--	139

Students Served

A total of 1,252 students from non-English language backgrounds were served by the end of the 1975-76 school year. Of these, 827 were LESAs and 425 were EGESAs. The EGESAs served participated primarily in bilingual RSM to maintain or develop fluency in their non-English language.

Table 12 summarizes the types of service and the number of LESAs and EGESAs served through each type of service. Tables 13 and 14 present the numbers of students in each of the major language groups who received the various services. Table 13 gives figures for the 827 LESAs served, while Table 14 gives figures for the 425 EGESAs served.

Table 15 gives the percentages of LESAs and EGESAs served for major language groups and other students from non-English language backgrounds. Chinese and Vietnamese speaking students had the highest rates of service, while Samoans had the lowest rate of service.

In April 1976, the LESAs not receiving service were studied to determine why they weren't receiving ESL or RSM services. The following breakdown was revealed:

- 25% no longer needed service (by April 1, 1976, most fluency ratings were almost a year old).
- 17% were enrolled in special education or other special academic programs.
- 25% were receiving services that had not yet been reported.
- 28% needed service which was unavailable.
- 5% had left school or their parents had refused service.

Approximately ninety-five percent of the LESA population were found to receive needed services.

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF SERVICES RECEIVED BY STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS, 1975-1976, BY SERVICE TYPE

Service Type	LESAs	EGESAs	Total
ESL Class Alone	258	114	372
Bilingual Class Alone	221	195	416
ESL Tutoring Alone	21	10	31
Bilingual Tutoring Alone	93	33	126
ESL Class & ESL Tutoring	28	3	31
ESL Class & Bilingual Tutoring	103	4	107
Bilingual Class & ESL Tutoring	14	3	17
Bilingual Class & Bilingual Tutoring	13	12	25
ESL Class & Bilingual Class	47	24	71
ESL Class & Bilingual Class & ESL Tutoring	3	4	7
ESL Class & Bilingual Class & Bilingual Tutoring	13	12	25
Missing Data (Language Used in Tutoring Not Specified)	13	11	24
TOTAL	827	425	1252

TABLE 13

SUMMARY OF SERVICES RECEIVED BY LESAS, 1975-76, BY SERVICE TYPE AND NATIVE LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

Service Type	Chinese	Filipino	Korean	Spanish	Japanese	Samoan	Viet-namese	Other	Total
ESL Class	44	37	46	20	15	19	31	46	258
Bilingual Class	121	33	24	6	3	6	17	11	221
ESL Tutoring	2	0	2	0	4	0	9	4	21
Bilingual Tutoring	2	4	12	3	3	0	64	5	93
ESL Class & ESL Tutoring	3	1	1	2	9	0	9	3	28
ESL Class & Bilingual Tutoring	1	1	24	2	2	0	73	0	103
Bilingual Class & ESL Tutoring	7	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	14
Bilingual Class & Bilingual Tutoring	7	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	13
ESL Class & Bilingual Class	41	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	47
ESL Class & Bilingual Class & ESL Tutoring	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
ESL Class & Bilingual Class & Bilingual Tutoring	5	3	1	0	0	0	4	0	13
Unspecified	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	13
TOTAL	235	88	116	36	36	27	214	75	827

TABLE 14

SUMMARY OF SERVICES RECEIVED BY EGESAS, 1975-76,
BY SERVICE TYPE AND NATIVE LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

Service Type	Chinese	Philippine Languages	Korean	Spanish	Japanese	Samoan	Viet-namese	Other	Total
ESL Class	21	32	7	1	7	18	4	24	114
Bilingual Class	129	48	3	4	1	5	0	5	195
ESL Tutoring	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	10
Bilingual Tutoring	6	2	1	18	1	3	0	2	33
ESL Class & ESL Tutoring	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
ESL Class & Bilingual Tutoring	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4
Bilingual Class & ESL Tutoring	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Bilingual Class & Bilingual Tutoring	6	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	12
ESL Class & Bilingual Class	6	12	3	0	0	2	0	1	24
ESL Class & Bilingual Class & ESL Tutoring	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
ESL Class & Bilingual Class & Bilingual Tutoring	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	12
Unspecified Special Service	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	11
TOTAL	188	103	16	36	10	29	9	36	425

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGES OF LESAS AND EGESAS FROM
VARIOUS LANGUAGE GROUPS WHO RECEIVED ESL OR RSM SERVICES
DURING THE 1975-76 SCHOOL YEAR

Language Group	Percent LESAs Served	Percent EGESAs Served
Chinese Languages	82%	38%
Filipino Languages	70%	29%
Korean	91%	26%
Spanish	67%	31%
Japanese	60%	8%
Samoan	51%	32%
Vietnamese	98%	50%
Other Languages	79%	2[illegible]%

Effects of Service on Student Achievement

The academic growth of students who participated in ESL or RSM services and students who did not participate in such services were compared to the academic growth rate of students Districtwide. Table 16 gives the deviation from the District average gain for served and unserved LESAs, and for all served and unserved students from non-English language backgrounds. Unserved LESAs showed gains significantly above the District average on the Reading, Language, and Spelling subtests of the MAT and gains similar to the District average on other subtests. Served LESAs showed gains in mathematics above the District average but fewer gains in Reading. Served students, from all fluency categories, showed higher gains in Mathematics and Spelling, and fewer gains in Reading. Unserved students were very similar, overall, to the District as a whole, except for higher gains in Spelling.

A comparison of the Fall test scores for each group revealed that students who received special service showed much lower initial achievement than unserved students on all but the Mathematics Computation subtest. It is likely that there were considerable differences between the students who received service and students not receiving service, so that a direct comparison of these two groups would be misleading.

It is impossible to precisely describe the factors involved in student achievement at this time. Student achievement appears to be related, in a complex way, to English fluency, grade level, and type of service, as well as other factors. The population of students studied was not large enough to identify the relationships between these factors.

TABLE 16

RELATIVE GAINS OF SERVED AND UNSERVED STUDENTS
COMPARED TO THE ENTIRE DISTRICT (APRIL, 1976)

MAT Subtest	LIMITED ENGLISH ABILITY STUDENTS				TOTAL STUDENTS FROM NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUND			
	SERVED		UNSERVED		SERVED		UNSERVED	
	N	GAIN	N	GAIN	N	GAIN	N	GAIN
Word Analysis[1]	35	+2.1	9	+13.4	79	+1.1	102	+2.5
Word Knowledge	87	-3.9*	42	+1.7	200	-2.7*	397	-1.0
Reading	87	-3.9*	42	+8.3**	202	-3.3*	392	+.3
TOTAL READING	85	-1.6	42	+6.1**	197	-1.6	390	-.2
LANGUAGE[2]	54	-2.5	31	+8.0**	124	-1.1	285	+1.9
SPELLING[2]	48	+.2	32	+11.4**	116	+4.6**	274	+4.7**
Math Computation[2]	83	+.8	32	+2.9	157	0.0	287	+1.7
Math Concepts[2]	79	-.6	31	+.2	150	-.1	289	+1.2
Math Problem Solving[2]	78	+3.2	33	-3.1	148	+.2	294	-.2
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	109	+5.0**	41	-.7	152	+2.4**	371	-.2
SCIENCE[3]	10	+2.4	10	-2.9	20	+1.8	87	-1.3
SOCIAL STUDIES[3]	12	-8.2	11	0.0	23	-4.6	95	+.3

[1]Only administered to second grade students

[2]Not administered to second grade students

[3]Optional in grades six and eight

*Significantly lower gains than the District as a whole

**Significantly greater gains than the District as a whole

CONCLUSIONS

1. Substantially all students from non-English language backgrounds who were dominant in languages other than English were identified through staff surveys. However, many students from non-English language backgrounds fluent in English were not identified.

2. The academic achievement of identified students reflected three major factors, as follows:

   - Students dominant in a language other than English showed considerably lower achievement on tests administered in English than students dominant in English, which primarily reflected English fluency rather than academic achievement.

   - Students from non-English language backgrounds, as a whole, showed a pattern of higher achievement in Spelling and Mathematics Computation and lower achievement in Reading than other students.

   - There was considerable variation among the language groups in students' overall achievement levels.

3. The District served students from non-English language backgrounds through a variety of programs of special English and native language instruction. However, the District was not able to guarantee special services to all students. An estimated five percent of the students did not receive needed service.

4. There was not enough data to adequately evaluate the effect of program participation due to the large numbers of factors which were found to influence student achievement.

APPENDIX

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HOME LANGUAGE IDENTIFICATION FORM 29B 1-3

CURRENT DATE ____ 4-9

SCHOOL _____ SCHOOL CODE NO. ____ 11-13

STUDENT NAME _____ STUDENT NO. ____ 14-20
(last) (first) (middle)

BIRTHDATE _____ GRADE _____
(mo.) (day) (yr.)

PARENT (or GUARDIAN'S) NAME: _____
(last) (first) (middle)

ADDRESS: _____

_____

_____

PHONE NUMBER: _____

Is the language first learned by the student English? Yes___ No___ ___ 23

If not, what is the language _____ Language code: ___ 24-26

Is the language most often spoken in the home English?

Yes___ No ___ ___ 27

If not, what is the language _____ Language code ___ 28-30

How well does the student speak and understand English?

Not at all____, A little____, Fairly well ____, Very well____ ___ 31

Note: If the student already has a permanent student number, use the permanent student number, If not, use the same temporary student number that is used on the Registration Record.

Form No. B1-12-75
Approved by: Mike Hickey

29B 7398

STUDENT LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT FORM

Name of Rater _____ / / / / / / / / / / /

Complete this form for each student identified as having a primary or home language other than English who has not been previously rated. All the students on this form should be rated by the same rater.

Student Name	File Number	Primary or Home Language	Language Code*	Language Rating**

* Enter appropriate code from attached list of languages.

** Enter "1" to "5" according to these criteria:

1 - No English, speaks only this language
2 - Some English, speaks mostly this language
3 - Half English, speaks English and this language equally well
4 - More English, speaks mostly English and some of this language
5 - Only English, speaks only English

Form No. B2-12-75

29B

ESL/BILINGUAL CLASS ROSTER

Program Code: /_/_/ Teacher: _____ Teacher Social Security Number: /_/_/_/_/_/_/_/_/_/ School: _____ /_/_/_/

Student Name	ID Number	Native Language	Lang. Code	Time/Week This Student is Seen		Diagnostic Test Information					
				N Days Per Wk.	N Min. Per Day	Test Score	Test Name	Test Code	Test Score	Test Name	Test Code

Please provide full information for each of your students. If you meet all students in this class for the same length of time each week, write in "minutes per day" and "days per week" only for the first student on the list.

Form No. B3-12-75

29B

Program Code /__/__/

ESL/BILINGUAL TUTORING INFORMATION

Tutor's Name _____ Social Security Number /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ School Served _____ /__/__/__/

Supervising Teacher _____ Social Security Number /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/__/__/

Tutor's present position: College Student ____ Parent ____ Community person ____ /__/

Tutor's relationship to school: Volunteer ____ Paid Assistant ____ Receives college credit for assistance ____ /__/

Time of tutoring sessions: After school hours or during students' free periods ____ During students' regular classes ____ /__/

Student Name	ID Number	Native Language	Lang. Code	Time/Week This Student is Seen		Student's Native Language Used In Tutoring		Content Areas in Which Student is Tutored				
				N Days Per Wk.	N Min. Per Day	Yes 1	No 0	English 1	Soc. Stud. 2	Math 3	Science 4	Other (write in) 5

Form No. 84-12-75